

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-29 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1-6, 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naqvi et al. US 6,545,992 in view of Gorsuch US 6,526,034.

Neither reference Naqvi, nor Gorsuch discloses a switch that interconnects CDMA and GSM infrastructures as required by independent claim 1 and independent claim 14. The Examiner refers to a Gorsuch subscriber unit that includes a CDMA protocol converter and a W-LAN converter and then states, “[I]t would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify system of Navqi et al to have a switch that interconnects two different protocols such as CDMA and GSM.” There is no teaching in Naqvi, nor Gorsuch suggesting such a switch. For the sake of argument, even if the Gorsuch subscriber unit had a CDMA protocol converter and a GSM protocol converter, there would be no reason to additionally have a switch that interconnects CDMA and GSM infrastructures. Thus, it is not obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Navqi et al to have a switch that interconnects CDMA and GSM infrastructures and independent claims 1 and 14 are patentable.

Dependent claims 2-7 are patentable since they depend on patentable independent claim 1. Dependent claims 15-20 are patentable since they depend on patentable independent claim 14.

Claims 8-9, 11-12, 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang et al. US 6,526,033. Independent claim 8 and independent claim 11 includes a limitation, “... in response to selection of IP by a user of a *CDMA* (emphasis added) mobile station.” Wang does not disclose this limitation. Wang regards a GSM user on a GSM mobile station 240, not a *CDMA* mobile station. Therefore, the 102(e) rejection is overcome and independent claims 8 and 11 are patentable. Claims 9, 21, and 23, 25 are also patentable since they depend on patentable independent claim 8. Claims 12-13, 22, and 24 are patentable since they depend on patentable independent claim 11.

[c1] Independent claim 26 discloses “[a] method for facilitating the use of a CDMA RAN with a GSM core infrastructure, comprising *selecting packet data protocol (PDP)*

*context as IP or PPP without changing a CDMA standard (emphasis added).*" There is no such selecting in the reference Wang. Thus, the 102(e) rejection of independent claim 26 is overcome and is patentable. Claim 29 is patentable since it depends on patentable independent claim 26.

Claims 10, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. in view of Naqvi et al. and Gorsuch. Wang does not disclose the claimed switch. As shown above, there is no teaching in Naqvi, nor Gorsuch suggesting such a switch. Thus, the 103(a) rejection of claims 10 and 13 are overcome and claims 10 and 13 are patentable.

Claims 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. in view of Naqvi. Claims 27 and 28 are patentable since they depend on patentable independent claim 26.

Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, in which prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 8, 2003

By: Albert J. Harnois

Albert J. Harnois  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 46,123

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
Attn: Patent Department  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-1714  
Telephone: (858) 651-4368